

REMARKS

Claims 7, 10, 13 and 17 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11-12 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled.

In the Office Action of September 1, 2009, claims 7, 10, 13 and 17 were rejected.

With this amendment, claims 7 and 17 are amended.

I. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for various informalities.

With this amendment, the specification is amended taking into consideration the examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this objection.

II. Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 7 and 17 for various informalities.

With this amendment, claims 7 and 17 are amended taking into consideration the examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this objection.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 7, 10, 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narang et al.* (US 6,168,885) in view of *Schneider et al.* (US 6,180,281) in view of *Gozdz et al.* (US 5,840,087) in view of *Kumeuchi et al.* (US 6,156,080) in view of *Takamiya et al.* (US 6,150,455). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1 and 17 recite the step of inserting and sealing wound electrodes into a film pack and then subjecting said wound electrodes to heat

treatment so that each of the first set of gel-electrode layers and the one of the second set of gel-electrolyte layers facing each other are integrated with each other into one continuous seamless layer.

The Examiner correctly asserts that *Narang* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest electrode sheets being wound and inserted into a film pack prior to heat treatment. See, Office Action of September 1, 2009, at Page 4.

Schneider and *Kumeuchi* each fail to disclose anything pertaining to inserting or sealing an electrode into a film pack, much less heat treating the film pack after inserting and sealing an electrode in the film pack. Instead, *Schneider* discloses placing an electrode into a plastic housing, dispensing an electrolyte into the package and letting the package stand for 16 hours at room temperature and ambient pressure. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,180,281, Col. 11, l. 8-24. *Kumeuchi* discloses placing an unsealed wound electrode into a mold and compressing the wound electrode before heat treating the wound electrode and then sealing the wound electrode with a laminating film. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,156,080, Col 10, l. 33-53.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by inserting and sealing wound electrodes into a film pack and then subjecting the wound electrodes to heat treatment so that each of the first set of gel-electrode layers and the one of the second set of gel-electrolyte layers facing each other are integrated with each other into one continuous seamless layer, a large discharge capacity and high energy density are realized. See, Specification, Page 21, l. 6-10.

Therefore, because *Kumeuchi*, *Narang*, *Schneider*, *Takamiya*, and any combination of them fail to disclose or even fairly suggest each feature of claims 7 and 17, the rejection of

Response September 1, 2009 Office Action
Application No. 09/504,813

claims 7 and 17 cannot stand. Because claims 10 and 13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 7 and 17, they are allowable for at least the same reason.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 1, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

12545898\V-1